

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-26, 28-31 and 34-36 have been rejected under § 102 based on Prasad (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,511) cited in this Office Action. Claims 9, 15, 27 and 32-33 have been objected to for being dependent upon rejected base claims.

In accordance with paragraph 4 of the Office Action at hand, objected Claims 9, 15, 27 and 32-33 have now been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims.

In particular, base Claim 5 is now amended to effectively recite dependent Claim 9 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of any intervening claims.

Base Claim 23 is now amended to effectively recite dependent Claim 27 in independent form including all of the limitations of any intervening claims.

New Claim 37 recites original Claim 15 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base Claim 5 and any intervening claims.

New Claim 38 recites original Claim 32 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base Claim 23 and any intervening claims.

New Claim 39 recites original Claim 33 rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of its base Claim 23 and any intervening claims.

Further, Claim 1 as now amended effectively rewrites Claim 15 in another independent form. Claim 19 as now amended is the parallel apparatus claim to amended method Claim 1 and includes the allowable subject matter of Claim 15.

Thus base Claims 1, 5, 19, 23 and new Claims 37-39 are believed to be allowable over the cited and prior art. Dependent Claims 2, 6, 9, 20, 24 and 27 are now cancelled. The remaining dependent claims are dependent on one of these base claims and thus similarly are believed to be allowable over the cited and prior art.

Acceptance is respectfully requested. No new matter has been introduced.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all pending claims (Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 10-19, 21-23, 25-26 and 28-39 are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a

telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mary Lou Wakimura
Mary Lou Wakimura
Registration No. 31,804
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 8/17/05